



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,277	03/31/2004	Kalle Tammi	59643.00385	5420
32294	7590	03/10/2009		EXAMINER
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/813,277	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAMMI ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> SHARAD RAMPURIA	<b>Art Unit</b> 2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **BAJKO et al.** [WO 200291785 A1] in view of **Rabe; Duane C. et al.** [US 5764730 A].

As per claim 1, BAJKO teaches: A method (Abstract, Pg.1; 5-8, Pg.10; 4-13), the method comprising: detecting that a user equipment has requested a registration to a second serving controller using at least one of said plurality of identities; in association with a first serving controller, the plurality of identities being associated with respective registration statuses selected from a registered status and an unregistered status issuing a registration termination

request identifying the at least one of the plurality of identities, which has been newly assigned to the second serving controller as a result of the requested registration; (Pg.11; 21-Pg.14; 8), and **BAJKO** doesn't teach specifically, responsive to the registration termination request, issuing a re-registration notification to the user equipment including the at least one of the plurality of identities which has a registered status and which was not assigned to the second serving controller as a result of the requested registration, and disassociating all identities of the said user from the first serving controller. However, **Rabe** teaches in an analogous art, that responsive to the registration termination request, issuing a re-registration notification to the user equipment including the at least one of the plurality of identities which has a registered status and which was not assigned to the second serving controller as a result of the requested registration, and disassociating all identities of the said user from the first serving controller. (Col.9; 58-Col.10; 19, Col.10; 37-Col.11; 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify **BAJKO** including responsive to the registration termination request, issuing a re-registration notification to the user equipment including the at least one of the plurality of identities which has a registered status and which was not assigned to the second serving controller as a result of the requested registration, and disassociating all identities of the said user from the first serving controller in order to provide a method of assigning user data in a communications system based on a plurality of identities for each user.

As per claims 2, 19, **BAJKO** teaches all the particulars of the claim except disassociating all identities of the said user from the first serving controller comprises removing the all identities and their data from the first serving controller, and removing their association in

the user information store with the first serving controller. However, **Rabe** teaches in an analogous art, that a method according to claims 1, 18, wherein the step of disassociating all identities of the said user from the first serving controller comprises removing the all identities and their data from the first serving controller, and removing their association in the user information store with the first serving controller. (i.e. deregister; Col.10; 44-62).

As per claims 3, 20, **BAJKO** teaches all the particulars of the claim except the plurality of identities include a set of unregistered statuses, and wherein the set is disassociated but not reassigned. However, **Rabe** teaches in an analogous art, that a method according to claims 1, 18, wherein the plurality of identities include a set of unregistered statuses, and wherein the set is disassociated but not reassigned. (i.e. Col.10; 44-62).

As per claim 4, **BAJKO** teaches:

A method according to claim 1, wherein the registration termination request includes a deregistration reason. (e.g based on timer value; Pg.15; 15-21).

As per claim 5, BAJKO teaches: A method according to claim 4, wherein the deregistration reason in a 3GPP communication system comprises NEW\_SERVER\_ASSIGNED. (i.e. newly selected S-CSCF2; Pg.14; 1-3).

As per claim 6, BAJKO teaches: A method according to claim 1, wherein the step of detecting that the user has requested registration comprises receiving at the user information store an authentication request. (Pg.12; 1-12, and 26-31).

As per claim 7, BAJKO teaches:

A method according to claim 1, wherein at least two users have a shared identity and a non-shared identity and the method further comprises a step of checking, when the non-shared identity has been newly assigned to the second serving controller, whether the user has the shared identity and, if so, issuing a re-registration notification to other users sharing the shared identity. (i.e. ID's; Pg.12; 1-31).

*Claims 8, 18, 14, 23* are the **system, apparatus**, computer-readable medium claims, corresponding to **method** claim 1 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 respectively, above.

As per claim 9, BAJKO teaches: A communications system according to claim 8, wherein the user information store comprises a home subscriber server. (24; Fig.1, Pg.9; 5-10)

As per claim 10, BAJKO teaches: A communications system according to claim 8, wherein the serving controller comprises a call state control function. (22-23; Fig.1, Pg.8; 25-32)

As per claim 11, BAJKO teaches:

A communications system according to claim 8, wherein the communications system is wireless. (1; Fig.1, Pg.8; 7-15)

As per claim 12, BAJKO teaches:

A communications system according to claim 8, wherein said plurality of identities includes a shared identity which is associated with at least one other user. (i.e. ID's; Pg.12; 1-31).

As per claim 13, BAJKO teaches:

A communications system according to claim 12, wherein the first serving controller is operable to issue a re-registration notification to the at least one other user. (i.e. ID's; Pg.12; 1-31).

As per claim 15, BAJKO teaches: A serving controller according to claim 14, which is operable to disassociate all identities of the said user by removing the identities and their data in the serving controller and by removing their association in the user information store, (i.e. ID's forced to move to the newly selected S-CSCF2 or not; Pg.14; 30-Pg.15; 13).

As per claim 16, BAJKO teaches: A serving controller according to claim 14, which is operable to read a deregistration reason in the registration termination request. (i.e. ID's forced to move to the newly selected S-CSCF2 or not; Pg.14; 30-Pg.15; 13).

As per claim 17, BAJKO teaches: A serving controller according to claim 14, which is operable to issue a re-registration notification to any other users sharing one of the said identities. (i.e ID's; Pg.14; 16-Pg.15; 21).

As per claim 21, BAJKO teaches: A system according to claim 18, wherein the detecting means comprises receiving means for receiving at the user information store an authentication request. (Pg.12; 1-12, and 26-31).

As per claim 22, BAJKO teaches: A system according to claim 18, wherein at least two users have a shared identity and a non-shared identity and the system further comprises checking means for checking, when the non-shared identity has been newly assigned to the second serving controller, whether the user has the shared identity and, if so, the notification means is

configured to issue a re-registration notification to other users sharing the shared identity. (i.e. ID's; Pg.14; 16-Pg.15; 21, furthermore Pg.11; 26-33).

***Response to Remarks***

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Relating to Claim 1:***

In view of the fact, that **RABE** teaches, "At step 603 the radiotelephone 303 deregisters the second subscriber identity 307 responsive to the step of receiving the indication of the incoming call. In the preferred embodiment, deregistration is accomplished by means of the IMSI Detach procedure and the IMSI Detach Indication message, as defined in the aforementioned GSM Technical Specification 4.08, sections 4.3.4 and 9.2.10, respectively. Once the radiotelephone 303 is active in a call with a subscriber identity 306, that radiotelephone is unable to listen for pages for a second subscriber identity 307. If the radiotelephone network 301 attempts to page the second subscriber identity 307, the page will go unanswered, which may result in a long delay while the radiotelephone network 301 attempts to page the subscriber identity 307, followed by the radiotelephone network 301 returning an out-of-service indication. The radiotelephone network 301 will no longer page a subscriber identity 306-308 once that subscriber identity 306-308 is deregistered, preventing the long delay, and possibly allowing the incoming call to be forwarded to another number or to be forwarded to voice mail. At step 604 the radiotelephone 303 continues the incoming call using the first subscriber identity 306

responsive to the step of deregistering the second subscriber identity 307. To continue the incoming call, the radiotelephone 303 and the radiotelephone network 301 simply continue whatever signaling is needed to connect the call and the voice channel. At step 605, the radiotelephone 303 determines if the incoming call has been ended. If the determination is negative, the radiotelephone 303 waits for the incoming call to end. If the determination is positive, at step 606 the radiotelephone 303 reregisters the second subscriber identity 307 responsive to ending the incoming call. Generally, the reregistration of the deregistered subscriber identities is accomplished by the same means as the initial registration. In the preferred embodiment, the radiotelephone 303 follows the procedures for registration in accordance with the aforementioned GSM Technical Specification 4.08, sections 4.4.3 and 4.4.4. Reregistration of the second subscriber identity 307 allows that subscriber identity to again receive incoming calls.” (Rabe, Col.10; 37-Col.11; 9). Thus, it is evidently, the explanations above is directed to telecommunications systems and methods for requesting the deregistration, that positively, edify by **RABE**. Hence, it is believed that **RABE** still teaches the claimed limitations.

The above arguments also recites for the other independent claims, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, as a result the response is the same justification as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000 or [EBC@uspto.gov](mailto:EBC@uspto.gov).

/Sharad Rampuria/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2617